arXiv:1512.07420v1 [math.CO] 23 Dec 2015

The local metric dimension of subgraph-amalgamation of graphs

Gabriel A. Barragán-Ramírez[a], Rinovia Simanjuntak[b], Suhadi W. Saputro[b], Saladin Uttunggadewa[b]

[a]*Departament d Enginyeria Informàtica i Matemàtiques*
Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Av. Països Catalans 26, 43007 Tarragona, Spain
gabrielantonio.barragan@estudiants.urv.cat
[b]*Combinatorial Mathematics Research Group*
Institut Teknologi Bandung, Jl. Ganesha 10 Bandung 40132, Indonesia
rino@math.itb.ac.id, suhadi@math.itb.ac.id, s_uttunggadewa@math.itb.ac.id

Abstract

A vertex v is said to distinguish two other vertices x and y of a nontrivial connected graph G if the distance from v to x is different from the distance from v to y. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a local metric set for G if every two adjacent vertices of G are distinguished by some vertex of S. A local metric set with minimum cardinality is called a local metric basis for G and its cardinality, the local metric dimension of G, denoted by $\dim_l(G)$. In this paper we present tight bounds for the local metric dimension of subgraph-amalgamation of graphs with special emphasis in the case of subgraphs which are isometric embeddings.

Keywords: metric dimension, local metric set, local metric basis, local metric dimension, subgraph-amalgamation, isometric embedding
2008 MSC: 05C12, 05C76

1. Introduction

All graphs considered in this paper are finite, simple, and non-null graphs. If G is a graph we denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ its vertex and edge sets respectively. If u and v are the end vertices of an edge we write uv for the edge itself. If $uv \in E(G)$ we say that u is *adjacent* to v (in G) and write $u \sim_G v$, omitting the sub index when there is no ambiguity.

Given two graphs G and H such that $V(G) \cap V(H) = \emptyset$ we define the *join* of G and H as the graph $G + H$ with $V(G + H) = V(G) \cup V(H)$ and $E(G + H) = E(G) \cup E(H) \cup \{uv : u \in V(G), v \in V(H)\}$. Now we can define the *generalized fan* on $m + n$ vertices as $F_{m,n} := \overline{K_m} + P_n$ where K_m is the complete graph on m vertices and P_n is the path on n vertices. The *generalized wheel* on $m + n$ vertices is $W_{m,n} := \overline{K_m} + C_n$ where C_n is the *cycle* on n vertices.

With respect to local metric dimension of a graph we define the following terms. For $u, v \in V(G)$ we define the *distance between* u and v, denoted by $d(u, v)$, as the length of the shortest $u-v$ path. $A \subseteq E(G)$ is *distinguished* by $B \subseteq V(G)$, if for each $uv \in A$ there exists $w \in B$ such that $d(w, u) \neq d(w, v)$. If $B \subseteq V(G)$ distinguishes $E(G)$ we say that B is a *local metric set* for G. A local metric set with minimum cardinality is called a *local metric basis* and its cardinality is called the *local metric dimension*, denoted by $\dim_l(G)$.

The study of local metric dimension of graphs was introduced in [6]. Among its numerous results we cite.

Theorem 1. *[6]* $\dim_l(G) = 1$ *if and only if* G *is a connected bipartite graph*

Theorem 2. *[6]* $\dim_l(G) \leq |V(G)| - 1$ *with equality if and only if* G *is a complete graph*

Since determining local metric dimension of a general graph G is an NP-complete problem [7], several researchers study the relation between local metric dimension of graphs resulting from some product graphs with the local metric dimension of the operand graphs ([8],[9], [10]).

In this paper we are interested in subgraph-amalgamation that we proceed to define. A graph J is an *induced subgraph* of a graph G if there exists an injective function $\iota : V(J) \to V(G)$, such that $\iota(u)\iota(v) \in E(G)$ if and only if $uv \in E(J)$. If J is a common induced subgraph for the family of graphs $\{G_i\}$, we denote by J_i the subgraph of G_i induced in G, or in other words the image of the embedding function $\iota_i : V(J) \to V(G_i)$. If $V(J) = \{u_j\}$, we write $V(J_i) = \{u_j^i\}$, where $u_j^i = \iota_i(u_j)$.

Let $\{G_i\}$ be a family of graphs with common induced subgraph J and embeddings J_i, where $V(G_i) = \{u_j^i\}$, $V(J) = \{v_k\}$, and $V(J_i) = \{v_k^i\}$. We define the *subgraph-amalgamation of* $\{G_i\}$ *over* J or J*-amalgamation of* $\{G_i\}$, denoted by $\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$, as the graph with vertex-set

$$V(\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}) = \bigcup V(G_i - J_i) \bigcup V(J)$$

and edge-set

$$E(\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}) = \bigcup E(G_i - J_i) \bigcup E(J) \bigcup \{u_j^i v_k | v_k \in V(J), u_j^i v_k^i \in E(G_i)\}.$$

This means we identify the vertices in the corresponding copies of J_i and preserve the adjacencies (here the importance of J being an *induced* subgraph).

In the case that the common induced subgraph is a vertex or an edge we speak about *vertex-amalgamation* or *edge-amalgamation* respectively. Previous work related with vertex-amalgamation could be found in [8], from where we have the following results.

Theorem 3. *[8] Let $\{G_i\}$ be a family of connected graphs and $v_i \in V(G_i)$. If $H := \amalg\{(G_i|v_i)\}$ then*

$$\dim_l(H) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if all } G_i s \text{ are bipartite;} \\ \dim_l(G_1), & \text{if exactly one of the } G_i s, \text{ say } G_1, \text{ is non-bipartite;} \\ \sum(\dim_l(G_i) - \epsilon_i), & \text{if at least two of the } G_i s \text{ are non-bipartite,} \\ & \text{where } \epsilon_i = 1 \text{ if } v_i \text{ is in a local metric basis of } G_i \\ & \text{and } 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We could also see the subgraph-amalgamation of graphs as a pushout in the category of graphs, which is a colimit of a diagram consists of n morphisms $\iota_i : J \to G_i$ with common domain J. For $n = 2$, it means that there exist morphisms f_1 and f_2 for which the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\} & \xleftarrow{f_2} & G_2 \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle f_1} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \iota_2} \\ G_1 & \xleftarrow{\iota_1} & J \end{array}$$

Moreover the subgraph-amalgamation of the family of graphs is universal in respect to the afore-mentioned diagram. Amalgamation occurs in different areas of mathematics, for instance in model theory where it plays a fundamental role in Fraïssé's theorem [2] which characterizes classes of countable homogeneous structures. Amalgamation is also one of the natural operations in data-bases [3]. Other applications of amalgamation could be found in [4] and [5].

2. Subgraph-amalgamation of Bipartite Graphs

Obviously

$$\dim_l(\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}) \geq 1$$

and we reach that bound when $\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ is a connected bipartite graph (Theorem 1). A necessary condition for $\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ to be bipartite is that all G_is are also bipartite.

Remark 4. *Let $\{G_i\}$ be a family of connected bipartite graphs and $J \cong K_1$ or K_2. If $H := \amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ then $\dim_l(H) = 1$.*

Proof. The result for $J \cong K_1$ follows from Theorem 3. For $J \cong K_2$, let $\{U_i, V_i\}$ be the partition classes of G_i and $V(J_i) = (u^i, v^i)$, where $u^i \in U_i$ and $v^i \in V_i$. Then H is bipartite with partition classes $\{\bigcup U_i, \bigcup V_i\}$. □

In Corollary 16, we shall provide generalization of this remark. However, we could also amalgamate two bipartite graphs to obtain a non-bipartite graph, as in the following example.

Example 5. *Let $G_1 \cong P_3$ and $G_2 \cong P_4$, where $V(G_1) = \{u_i\}$, and $V(G_2) = \{v_i\}$. $J \cong \overline{K_2}$ is a common induced subgraph for $\{G_1, G_2\}$, where $V(J_1) = (u_1, u_3)$ and $V(J_2) = (v_1, v_4)$ then $\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\} \cong C_5$ and so $\dim_l(\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}) = 2$.*

In fact local metric dimension of subgraph-amalgamation of two bipartite graphs could be as great as desired as we see in the next example. Recall that a *spider* is a tree with a single vertex of degree at least three (called the *head of the spider*) and remaining vertices of degree at most two. If we consider the multiset $\{m_i^{\alpha_i}\}$, we denote by $Sp\{m_i^{\alpha_i}\}$ the (unique) spider with exactly α_i pendant vertices at distance m_i from the head.

Example 6. *Let $G_1 \cong Sp\{2^n\}$ and $G_2 \cong Sp\{3^n\}$. Define $V(G_1) = \{u_j^i\}$ and $V(G_2) = \{v_j^i\}$, where the sub-index indicates the distance of the vertex to the head of the spider. If $J \cong \overline{K_{n+1}}$, with $V(J_1) = (u_0^1, \{u_2^i\})$ and $V(J_2) = (v_0^1, \{v_3^i\})$ then $H := \amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\} \cong \amalg\{(H_i|u_0^1)\}$, where $\{H_i\}$ is a family of n cycles on 5 vertices. Then by Theorem 3, $\dim_l(H) = n$.*

On the other hand, if any of the G_i's is not bipartite, neither is $\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ and, in this case, $\dim_l(\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}) \geq 2$.

3. General Lower and Upper Bounds

Let J be an induced subgraph of a graph G. We define and edge uv in $E(G-J)$ as *parallel to* J in G, if for every $w \in V(J)$, $d(w,u) = d(w,v)$. We denote the set of parallel edges to J in G as $\parallel (J:G)$. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is *out-solving for* J if for every edge $uv \in E(J)$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $d(s,u) \neq d(s,v)$. An out-solving set is said to be *minimal* if it has the smallest cardinality.

From now on, let us consider $H = \amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$.

Lemma 7. *If for a vertex $a \in V(H)$ and an edge $uv \in \parallel (J_i : G_i)$, $d_H(a,u) \neq d_H(a,v)$, then $a \in V(G_i - J_i)$.*

Proof. Let $a \in V(H)$ and $uv \in \parallel (J_i : G_i)$ such that, without lost of generality, $d_H(a,u) = d_H(a,v) - 1$. For a contradiction, assume that $a \notin V(G_i - J_i)$. Let P be a minimal path between a and u and consider $u_1 \in V(T) \cap V(J)$. Thus $d_H(a,v) \leq d_H(a,u_1) + d_H(u_1,v) = d_H(a,u_1) + d_H(u_1,u) = d_H(a,u)$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 7 states that for each G_i we have a set $T_i \subseteq V(G_i - J_i)$ such that for every edge $uv \in \parallel (J_i : G_i)$, there exists a vertex $a \in T_i$ such that $d_H(a,u) \neq d_H(a,v)$. Such a set T_i with minimum cardinality is called a *traversal for* $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$ or, simply, a traversal when there is no ambiguity.

Remark 8. *A set T distinguishes $\cup \parallel (J_i : G_i)$ if and only if for each G_i, $T \cap V(G_i)$ distinguishes $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$.*

The afore-mentioned remark leads to a lower bound for $\dim_l(H)$.

Theorem 9. *If T_i is a traversal for $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$ and S is a minimal out-solving set for J then*

$$\dim_l(H) \geq \sum |T_i| + |S|$$

and the bound is tight.

Proof. Assume for the contrary that there exists a local metric basis C for H such that $|C| < |\cup T_i \cup S|$. Then C must be an out-solving set for J. For each G_i we define $V(C_i) = V(C) \cap V(G_i)$ and so there exists a C_k such that $|C_k| < |T_k|$. By Remark 8, C_k is not a traversal for $\parallel (J_k : G_k)$. Thus there exists $uv \in \parallel (J_k : G_k)$ which is not resolved by C_k. From Lemma 7, there

is no vertex in $V(C) - \bigcup_{i \neq k} V(G_i - J_i)$ resolving such an edge. That is a contradiction and the result follows.

The tightness of the bound could be seen in the following example. Let $G_i \cong F_i + J$ where $\{F_i\}$ is a collection of at least two graphs and J is an arbitrary graph. Then for $u_0 \in J$ and $v_0 \in F_i$ we have that $\dim_l(H) = \sum(\dim_l(u_0+F_i)-\epsilon_i)+(\dim_l(v_0+J)-\epsilon_J)$, where $\epsilon_i = 0$ if u_0 is not contained in any basis of $u_0 + F_i$ or 1 otherwise, and ϵ_J is defined in an analogous way. On the other hand, since $\parallel (J_i|G_i) = E(F_i)$, then we could choose $B_i - \{u_0\}$ as a traversal for $\parallel (J_i|G_i)$, where B_i is a local metric basis for $u_0 + F_i$. We also have that, for S an out-solving set for J, $S \cap V(M_i) = \emptyset$ and so we could choose $B_J - \{v_0\}$ as a minimal out-solving set for J, where B_J is a local metric basis for $v_0 + J$. This leads to $\dim_l(H) = \sum |T_i| + |S|$. □

Another example for the tightness of the bound in Theorem 9 is as follow.

Example 10. *Let $G_1 \cong W_{1,n}$ be a wheel on $n+1$ vertices, $G_2 \cong C_n \square K_2$ be a prism on $2n$ vertices, and $J \cong C_n$. Then* $\dim_l(H) = \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil = 0 + 0 + \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil = |T_1| + |T_2| + |S|$.

By Example 6 we could see that we could not state a general upper bound for the local metric dimension of a subgraph-amalgamation of graphs as a function of the local metric dimension of the amalgamated graphs. In that example, the order of the induced subgraph J is unbounded, however the next example shows that even if both the local metric dimension of the amalgamated graphs and the order of J are bounded, the local metric dimension of the subgraph-amalgamation graph remains unbounded.

Example 11. *We start with constructing the first amalgamated graph. Consider a cycle of order 17, with vertex-set $\{u_i\}$. We introduce a new vertex v, together with four edges u_1u_9, u_5u_{14}, vu_5, and vu_{14}. We shall denote the resulting graph with Q. For $n \geq 4$, let $\{Q_i\}$ be a family of n graphs with $Q_i \cong Q$. Let $I \cong K_2 \cup K_1$ where $V(I) = \{a, b, c\}$ and $E(I) = \{ab\}$. Define $G_1 = \amalg\{(Q_i|I_i)\}$ with $V(I_i) = \{u_1^i, u_9^i, v^i\}$ and $E(I_i) = \{u_1^i u_9^i\}$. We have* $\dim_l(G_1) = 2$ *since the vertices a and b distinguish $E(G_1)$. Let the second amalgamated graph be $G_2 \cong v_0 + P_3$ with $V(G_2) = \{v_0, w_1, w_2, w_3\}$. Clearly,* $\dim_l(G_2) = 2$ *being $\{v_0, w_2\}$ is a local metric basis. Now we are ready to define the subgraph-amalgamation $H := \amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}$, where $J \cong \overline{K_2}$, $V(J_1) = (b, c)$, and $V(J_2) = (w_1, w_3)$.*

To show that the local metric dimension of H is unbounded, consider the edge $u_5^i u_{14}^i$ for an arbitrary fixed i. We have $d_H(a, u_5^i) = 4 = d_H(a, u_{14}^i)$,

$d_H(b, u_5^i) = 3 = d_H(b, u_{14}^i)$, $d_H(c, u_5^i) = 1 = d_H(c, u_{14}^i)$, *and* $d_H(z, u_5^i) = 2 = d_H(z, u_{14}^i)$, *if* $z \in \{v_0, w_2\}$. *For any vertex in* $z \in V(Q_j)$, $j \neq i$, *the following hold.* $d_H(z, u_5^i) = 5 = d_H(z, u_{14}^i)$, *if* $z \in N(a) - \{b\}$, *or* $d_H(z, u_5^i) = k = d_H(z, u_{14}^i)$, *where* $k \in \{3, 4\}$, *if* $z \in N(b)$, *or* $d_H(z, u_5^i) = \min\{d_H(z, u_5^j), d_H(z, u_{14}^j)\} + 2 = d_H(z, u_{14}^i)$, *for other* z. *We conclude that to resolve* $u_5^i u_{14}^i$ *we need a vertex in* $Q_i - J$. *Since* $v_0 w_2 \in\!\| (S_2 : G_2)$, $\dim_l(H) = n + 1$.

In general we have a very crude upper bound.

Theorem 12. *If* $\{G_i\}$ *is a family of* n *graphs and* $n_H = |V(H)|$ *then*

$$\dim_l(H) \leq n_H - (n + 1)$$

and the bound is tight.

Proof. Let $u \in V(J)$ and v_i be a chosen vertex in each $V(G_i - J_i)$. We define $A = \{v_i\} \cup \{u\}$ and $B = V(H) - A$. Clearly $|B| = |V(H)| - |A| = n_H - (n+1)$. Let uv be an edge with $u, v \in V(H) - B$ where $u \in V(G_i - J_i)$ and $v \in V(J_i)$. For any vertex $w \in V(G_j - J_j)$, $j \neq i$, we have $d_H(w, u) = d_H(w, v) + 1$. This confirms that B is a local metric metric set for H.

For the tightness, consider $H := \amalg\{(K_{m_i} | K_r)\}$, for m_i and r are positive integers with $m_i > r$. Then $\dim_l(H) = \sum m_i - (r + 1)(n - 1) - 2 = n_H - (n + 1)$. □

However we could amalgamate arbitrarily large bipartite graphs obtaining yet another bipartite graph and thus show that the upper bound is, in a lot of cases, still far away from the real value.

Example 13. *Let* $\{m_i\}$ *be a set of odd numbers greater than 1 and* $G_i \cong P_{m_i}$. *We define* $J \cong \bar{K}_2$, *with* $V(J_i) = \{u_1^i, u_{m_i}^i\}$ *where* u_1^i *and* $v_{m_i}^i$ *are the pendants in the paths. We have* $n_H - (n+1) = 2 + \sum(m_i - 2) - (n+1) = 1 + \sum(m_i - 3)$, *but* $\dim_l(H) = 1$, *since* H *is connected and bipartite.*

In the next section, we shall consider a special case of subgraph-amalgamation where we could have more information about the local metric dimension.

4. Subgraph-amalgamation with Isometric Embedding

As in the previous section, let $\{G_i\}$ be a family of graphs with common induced subgraph J and embeddings J_i, and we denote $H := \amalg\{(G_i | J_i)\}$. If

$\iota_i : J \to G_i$ is an embedding of J in G_i we call $J_i := \iota_i(J)$ the image of the embedding and, for each vertex $v \in V(J)$, $v^i := \iota_i(v)$. If J is a subgraph of G, we say that J is *isometrically embedded* in G, if for every $u, v \in V(G)$, $d_J(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$. We remark that an isometrically embedded subgraph is also an induced subgraph. We also say that $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ is *isometric* if for every G_i, G_j and $a, b \in V(J)$, $d_{G_i}(a^i, b^i) = d_{G_j}(a^j, b^j)$. In the next lemma, we shall show that the notions of isometrically embedded and isometric are equivalent.

Lemma 14. *Let G_i be a connected graph. G_i is isometrically embedded in H if and only if $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ is isometric.*

Proof. The necessity of the condition is clear. Now suppose that for every i, j and $a, b \in V(J)$, $d_{G_i}(a^i, b^i) = d_{G_j}(a^j, b^j)$. Consider $u, v \in V(G_i)$ and let P_{uv} be a minimal path in H between u and v. If $P_{uv} \subseteq G_i$ we are done, otherwise there exist $j \neq i$ and $b \in V(G_j)$ such that $b \in P_{uv}$. Let $u_1 \in V(J) \cap P_{ub}$ and $v_1 \in V(J) \cap P_{vb}$ such that $d_H(u_1, u)$ and $d_H(v_1, v)$ are minimal. By hypotheses there exist $P_{u_1v_1} \subseteq G_i$ a minimal path between u_1 and v_1 with $length(P_{u_1v_1}) = d_{G_i}(u_1, v_1) = d_{G_j}(u_1, v_1) \leq d_{G_j}(u_1, b) + d_{G_j}(b, v_1)$. If we define $P^* = P_{uu_1} \cup P_{u_1v_1} \cup P_{v_1v}$, then $P^* \subseteq G_i$ and P^* is a u, v path with length at most $d_{G_j}(u, v)$, so $d_{G_i}(u, v) \leq d_{G_j}(u, v) = length(P_{uv})$ and, as P_{uv} is a minimal path, the result follows. □

The following gives a sufficient condition for isometric embedding.

Lemma 15. *If diameter of J is at most 2 then every G_i is embedded isometrically in H.*

Proof. Assume that G_i is not embedded isometrically in H, that means that there exist $u, v \in V(G_i)$ such that $d_{G_i}(u, v) \neq d_H(u, v)$, necessarily $d_H(u, v) < d_{G_i}(u, v)$. For Lemma 14 we could suppose that $u, v \in V(J_i)$, and so $d_H(u, v) < d_{G_i}(u, v) \leq d_{J_i}(u, v) \leq 2$. Thus $u \sim_H v$ and as G_i is an induced subgraph of H, $u \sim_{G_1} v$, a contradiction. □

The next lemma generalizes result in Remark 4 on subgraph-amalgamation of connected bipartite graphs.

Corollary 16. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric. If for every i, G_i is connected and bipartite, then* $\dim_l(H) = 1$.

Proof. For every $v \in V(J)$, $\{v_i\}$ is a local metric set for G_i, then $\{v\}$ is a metric set for H. Thus H is connected and bipartite, and therefore $\dim_l(H) = 1$. □

Corollary 17. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_i\}$ be a family of connected graphs with at least one G_i non-bipartite and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the subset of all non-bipartite graphs in $\mathcal{G}$. If J is isometrically embedded then*

$$\dim_l(\amalg_{\mathcal{G}}\{(G_i|J_i)\}) = \dim_l(\amalg_{\mathcal{H}}\{(G_i|J_i)\}).$$

Example 18. *By the afore-mentioned corollary, if $\{(C_i|J_i)\}$ is isometric, where not all C_i's are of even order, then* $\dim_l(\amalg\{(C_i|J_i)\}) = 2$.

The importance of isometric embedding in determining local metric dimension of subgraph-amalgamation is illustrated in the following lemma.

Lemma 19. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric. If $A_i \subseteq V(G_i)$ is a local metric set for G_i then $\bigcup A_i$ is a local metric set for H.*

Proof. Let uv be an edge in H and $u, v \in V(G_i)$. As A_i is a local metric set for G_i, there exists $b \in A_i$ such that $d_H(b,u) = d_{G_i}(b,u) \neq d_{G_i}(b,v) = d_H(b,v)$. And the result follows. □

Example 5 shows that isometricity is sufficient for the union of local metric sets of the amalgamated graphs to be a local metric set for the subgaph-amalgamation. Now we are ready to present upper bounds for subgraph-amalgamation with isometric embedings.

Theorem 20. *If $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ is isometric and T_i is a traversal for $\| (J_i : G_i)$ then*

$$\dim_l(H) \leq \min\{\sum \dim_l(G_i), \sum |T_i| + |J|\}$$

and the bound is tight.

Proof. $\dim_l(H) \leq \sum \dim_l(G_i)$ is a direct consequence of Lemma 19. It is clear that $T_i \cup V(J)$ is a metric set for G_i. Now define $B = (\cup T_i) \cup V(J)$. By Lemma 19, B is a local metric set for H and the result follows.

We could see that the first part of the bound is tight with the following example. Let $G_1 \cong G_2 \cong \amalg\{(v_0 + P_6|v_0), (C_4|u_1)\}$. Consider the graph $H := \amalg\{(G_i|C_4)\}$, then $\dim_l(H) = 4 = 2 + 2 = \dim_l(G_1) + \dim_l(G_2)$.

The tightness of the second part of the bound is shown in the next example. Let $G_1 \cong K_n$, $G_2 \cong C_{2m+1}$, and $J \cong K_2$. Then $|T_1| = m - 3$, $|T_2| = 0$, $|J| = 2$, and $\dim_l(H) = m - 1 = \sum |T_i| + |J| < \dim_l(G_1) + \dim_l(G_2) = m + 1$. □

We shall proceed with examining several conditions that ensure that the first bound in Theorem 20 is achieved. The first condition examines the relation between local metric basis of the amalgamated graphs.

Lemma 21. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric. If $\dim_l(H) = \sum \dim_l(G_i)$ and B_k is a local metric basis for G_k then, for every $i \neq j$, $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist local metric basis B_1 and B_2 of G_1 and G_2 such that $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 19, $\dim_l(H) \leq |\cup B_i| = |(B_1 \cup B_2) \cup_{i>2} B_i| < \sum |B_i| = \sum \dim_l(G_i)$. □

However this lemma does not characterize the graphs whose subgraph-amalgamation's local dimension equals the sum of their dimensions, as we could see in the following example.

Example 22. *Let G be a graph obtained from K_4, where $V(K_4) = \{u_i\}$, with two new vertices v and w with neighborhoods $N(v) = \{u_1, u_2\}$ and $N(w) = \{u_2, u_3\}$. Consider $G_i \cong G$ and $J \cong K_4$, which is isometrically embedded in H. The only local basis of G_i is $B_i = \{v^i, w^i\}$, and clearly, for $i \neq j$, $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$. However, $\dim_l(\amalg\{(G_i|J_i)\}) = 2$.*

The second condition deals with a relation between a local metric basis of an amalgamated graphs with an isometric embedding J.

Lemma 23. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric. If for every local metric basis B_i of G_i, $B_i \cap V(J_i) = \emptyset$ then $\dim_l(H) = \sum \dim_l(G_i)$.*

Proof. Assume, for a contradiction, that $dim_l(H) < \sum \dim_l(G_i)$. Let B be a local metric basis for H and $B_i = B \cap V(G_i - J_i)$. Thus it is necessary for one of the B_is, say B_1, $|B_1| < \dim_l(G_1)$ holds. So there exist $uv \in E(G_1)$ not distinguished by B_1. As B is a local metric basis, there exist $b \in B - B_1$ such that, without lost of generality, $d(b,u) = d(b,v) - 1$. Let P_{bu} a minimal path between b and u and $b_1 \in P_{bu} \cap V(J)$. b_1 distinguishes uv because otherwise $d(b,v) \leq d(b,u_1) + d(u_1,v) = d(b,u) + d(u_1,u) = d(b,u)$, a contradiction. If $B_1 \cup \{b_1\}$ resolves $E(G_1)$ we obtain a contradiction because there exists a local metric basis for G_1 that intersects $V(J)$; otherwise we could repeat the procedure until a contradiction is obtained, and the result follows. □

The sufficient condition in Lemma 23 is not necessary as shown in the next example.

Example 24. *Let* $G_1 \cong G_2 \cong F_{1,9} \cong v + P_9$, $J \cong F_{1,3}$, *where* $V(G_i) = \{v, u_j^i\}$, $V(J_1) = (v_0^1, u_7^1, u_8^1, u_9^1)$, *and* $V(J_2) = (v_0^2, u_1^2, u_2^2, u_3^2)$. *Then* $H \cong F_{1,15}$ *and* $\dim_l(H) = 4 = \sum \dim_l(G_i)$. *However each* G_i *has only one local metric basis, namely,* $B_i = \{u_3^i, u_7^i\}$, *and so* $B_1 \cap J = \{u_7^1\}$ *and* $B_2 \cap J = \{u_3^2\}$.

The last condition based on connection between local metric basis and traversal sets.

Lemma 25. *If every traversal* T_i *for* $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$ *contains a local metric basis for* G_i, *then* $\dim_l(H) = \sum \dim_l(G_i)$.

Proof. Recall that every local metric set contains a traversal (Theorem 9) and the result follows. □

We could construct an infinite family of graphs that fulfill the conditions in Lemma 25, as we show in the following. We recall that $\chi(G)$ denotes the *chromatic number* of G.

Lemma 26. *Let* J *be an arbitrary graph and* $m \geq \chi(J)$. *Then there exists a graph* G, *such that*

1. J *is an induced subgraph of* G,
2. $\dim_l(G) = m$, *and*
3. *There exists* B *a local metric basis for* G *such that* $B \cap V(J) = \emptyset$.

Proof. We shall consider two separate cases.

Case I: $\chi(J) = 1$. In this case $J \cong \overline{K_n}$. For $m = 1$ take $G \cong J + K_1$ and $B = V(K_1)$. For $m \geq 2$ we take $G \cong J + P_{4m+1}$. If $V(P_{4m+1}) = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^{4m-1}$ then $B = \{u_{4i-1}\}_{i=1}^{m}$.

Case II: $\chi(J) \geq 2$. Let $\{U_i\}$ be the color classes of J and $X := \{x_i y_i\}$ be a set of m new edges. Construct G as the graph resulting from connecting x_i and y_i to a vertex $u \in U_j$ with edges $x_i u$ and $y_i u$ if $i \equiv j \ mod\ \chi(J)$ or with disjoint paths $P_{x_i u}$ and $P_{y_i u}$ of length 2 otherwise. Then J is an induced sugraph of G, $\parallel (J : G) = X$, and $T = \{x_i\}$ is a traversal for $\parallel (J : G)$. Clearly, $|T| = |X| = m$. We shall show that T is also a local metric basis for G. First we observe that T distinguishes X. Since edges in X are disjoint and no vertex in $V(J)$ distinguishes an edge in X, then there is no set S with $|S| < |T|$ could distinguish edges in X. Now consider $uv \in E(G) - X$. If $u = x_i$ then $x_i \in T$ distinguishes u from v. If $u = y_i$ and $v \in U_j$ with $j \equiv i \ mod\ \chi(J)$, then for $x_k \in T$, $k \not\equiv j \ mod\ \chi(J)$, we

have $d(x_k, v) = 2 \neq 3 = d(x_k, u)$. If $u = y_i$ and $v \in P_{y_i w}$, where $w \in U_j$, then for $x_k \in T$, $k \equiv j \ mod\ \chi(J)$, we have $d(x_k, v) = 2 \neq 3 = d(x_k, u)$. If $uv \in E(J)$, say without lost of generality, $u \in U_i$ and $v \in U_j$, consider $x_k \in T$, $k \equiv i \ mod\ \chi(J)$. And so we have $d(x_k, u) = 1 \neq 2 = d(x_k, v)$. So T is a local metric basis and the result follows. □

4.1. A Better Upper Bound Using Co-traversals

In spite of the tightness of the bound in Theorem 20, we could find examples whose local metric dimensions are still much smaller than the bounds, as we can see in the following.

Example 27. *For $i = 1, .., n$ and $m > 5$, let $G_i \cong v_0 + P_m$ and $J \cong P_m$. $\dim_l(G_i) = \left\lceil \frac{m-1}{4} \right\rceil$, and so $\sum \dim_l(G_i) = n \left\lceil \frac{m-1}{4} \right\rceil$. On the other hand, $|T_i| = 0$, $|J| = m$, and $\sum |T_i| + |J| = m$. However, $\dim_l(H) = \left\lceil \frac{m-1}{4} \right\rceil$. In fact, the local metric dimension is equal to the lower bound given by Theorem 9.*

This example motivates the following definition. Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric and T_i be a traversal for $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$. We say that $C \subseteq V(J)$ is a *co-traversal*, if for every $uv \in E(G_i) - E(J)$ there exists $a \in C \cup T_i$ that distinguishes uv and C is such a set of minimum cardinality. It is clear that $V(J)$ is both co-traversal and out-solving. Thus C is a co-traversal and S is a minimal out-solving set for J then $|C \cup S| \leq |J|$ and we have the following statement which is an improvement for the upper bound.

Theorem 28. *Let $\{(G_i, J_i)\}$ be isometric with T_i a traversal for $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$, C a co-traversal, and S a minimal out-solving set for J. Then*

$$\dim_l(H) \leq \sum |T_i| + |C \cup S|$$

and the bound is tight.

Proof. The proof is an application of the definitions and Theorem 20. Example 27 gives the tighness of the bound. □

Corollary 29. *Let $\{(G_i, J_i)\}$ be isometric with T_i a traversal for $\parallel (J_i : G_i)$, C a co-traversal, and S a minimal out-solving set for J. If $C \subseteq S$ then*

$$\dim_l(H) = \sum |T_i| + |S|.$$

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Theorems 9 and 20. □

We shall give two examples for Corollary 29.

Example 30. *Suppose that K_5 is a complete graph with vertex-set $\{u_i\}$. Let $G_1 \cong G_2 \cong K_5 - \{u_1u_3, u_1u_4\}$, $J \cong K_2$, and $J_i = (u_3^i, u_4^i)$. Then $\| (J_i : G_i) = \{u_2^iu_5^i\}$ and $C = S = \{u_3\}$, and thus $\dim_l(H) = 3 = \sum |T_i| + |S|$.*

Example 31. *Let J be an arbitrary graph. For $m_i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $G_i \cong J + \overline{K_{m_i}}$. We observe that, for every G_i, $\| (J_i : G_i) = \emptyset$, and so by Theorem 28, if C is a co-traversal and S is an out-solving set for J, $\dim_l(H) \leq |C \cup S|$.*

Let $v_1 \in V(\overline{K_{m_1}})$ and B be a local metric basis for $J + v_1$. We shall show that B is also a local metric basis for H. As B is a local metric basis for $J + v_1$, $B - \{v_1\}$ distinguishes $E(J)$. Consider $uv \in E(H - J)$, necessarily $u \in V(\overline{K_{m_i}})$ and $v \in V(J)$. We have two cases. ***Case I:*** *$v_1 \in B$. In this case, if $u = v_1$ $d(v_1, u) = 0 \neq 1 = d(v_1, v)$, otherwise, $d(v_1, u) = 2 \neq 1 = d(v_1, v)$.* ***Case II:*** *$v_1 \notin B$. This means that there exists $b \in B$ such that $b \not\sim v$, and so $d(b, v) = 2 \neq 1 = d(b, v_1)$. Thus, B is a local metric set for H. If there exists $A \subseteq V(H)$ such that A is a local metric set and $|A| < |B|$ that means that A is not a local metric basis for $J + v_1$. Therefore there exists $uv \in E(v_1 + J) \subseteq E(H)$ such that A does not distinguishes uv, a contradiction. This leads to B being a local metric basis and $\dim_l(H) = \dim_l(J + K_1)$.*

On the other hand, if $v_1 \in B$, $\{v_1\}$ is a co-traversal and $B - \{v_1\}$ is a minimal out-solving set for J. If $v_1 \notin B$, then B is both a co-traversal and a minimal out-solving set for J.

Inspired by Example 31 we could observe the two following more general results.

Lemma 32. *Let $J \cong \overline{K_m}$ and $\{(G_i, J_i)\}$ be isometric. If $L_i = G_i - J_i$ then*

$$\dim_l(H) \leq \sum \dim_l(L_i + K_1) + 1.$$

Lemma 33. *Let J be an arbitrary graph, $G_1 \cong J + \overline{K_m}$, with $m \geq 1$, and for $i > 1$, G_i be a graph containing an induced subgraph $J_i \cong J$. If $v \in V(G_i) - V(J_i)$ implies $N(v) \subseteq V(J_i)$ and $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ is isometric then*

$$\dim_l(J + K_1) \leq \dim_l(H) \leq \dim_l(J + K_1) + \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon = 1$ if there exists a basis of $J + K_1$ not containing the only vertex in K_1, and $\epsilon = 0$ otherwise.

Proof. Observe that, for every G_i, $\parallel (J_i : G_i) = \emptyset$. Therefore, by Theorem 28, if C is a co-traversal for H and S is a minimal out-solving set for J then $\dim_l(H) \leq |C \cup S|$. Let $v_1 \in V(\overline{K_m})$ and B a local metric basis for $J + v_1$. We shall show that $B \cup \{v_1\}$ is a local metric basis for H. As B is a local metric basis for $J + v_1$, $B - \{v_1\}$ distinguishes $E(J)$. Consider $uv \in E(H - J)$, necessarily $u \in V(J)$ and $v \notin V(J)$. If $v = v_1$ then $d(v_1, u) = 1 \neq 0 = d(v_1, v)$ and otherwise, $d(v_1, u) = 1 \neq 2 = d(v_1, v)$. Thus $B \cup \{v_1\}$ is a local metric set. Now assume that there exists $A \subseteq V(H)$ such that A is a local metric set and $|A| < |B \cup \{v_1\}|$. We shall consider two cases: **Case I:** $v_1 \in B$**.** In this case A is not a local metric basis for $J + v_1$ and so there exists $uv \in E(J + v_1) \subseteq E(H)$ such that A does not distinguishes uv, a contradiction. **Case II:** $v_1 \notin B$**.** To avoid the former contradiction, we must have $|A| = |B| = \dim_l(J + K_1)$, and the result follows. □

4.2. Yet A Better Upper Bound Using Covers

Again we could find examples where the bound in Theorem 28 is still far away from the local metric dimension of the subgraph-amalgamation.

Example 34. *For $m > 1$ and $r = 4m + 1$, consider $G \cong v_0 + P_r$, where $V(P_r) = \{u_j\}$. Let $\{G_i\}$ be a set of n graphs isomorphic to G and $J \cong \overline{K_m}$, with $V(J_i) = (u^i_{4k+3})$. Notice that J_i is a local metric basis for G_i and so $\dim_l(G_i) = m$. We also have that $\parallel (J_i : G_i) = \{v^i_0u^i_{4k+2}, v^i_0u^i_{4k+4}\}$, $T_i = \{v^i_0\}$ is a traversal, $V(J)$ is a co-traversal, and $S = \emptyset$. Theorem 28 gives $\dim_l(H) = \sum |T_i| + |C \cup S| = n + m$, however $\dim_l(H) = n$, since $\{v^i_0\}$ is a local metric basis for H.*

In a quest for a better upper bound, we define the following. For $uv \in E(G)$, we say that uv is *solvable by* J, if $d(u, J) \neq d(v, J)$ and, in this case, we write $uv \in Solv(J : G)$.

Lemma 35. *Let $\{(G_i, J_i)\}$ be an isometric amalgam, $uv \in Solv(J_i : G_i)$, where $d(u, J) < d(v, J)$, and $c \in V(J)$. If $d(u, c) = d(u, J)$ then c distinguishes uv. Moreover, if for $j \neq i$ there exists $s \in V(G_j)$ such that $d(s, c) = d(s, J)$ then s distinguishes uv.*

Proof. The first result follows form $d(v, c) \geq d(v, J) > d(u, J) = d(u, c)$. If $s \in V(J_j)$ then the second result is trivial. Now let $s \in V(G_j - J_j)$ and suppose, for a contradiction, $d(s, u) = d(s, v)$. Let P_{su} and P_{sv} be the two minimal paths from s to u and from s to v. Let $u_1 \in P_{su} \cap V(J)$ and

$v_1 \in P_{sv} \cap V(J)$. By the definition of c, $d(s,u_1) + d(u_1,u) = d(s,u) \leq d(s,c) + d(c,u) \leq d(s,u_1) + d(u_1,u)$ and so $d(s,u) = d(s,c) + d(c,u)$. On the other hand,

$$d(s,v_1) + d(v_1,v) = d(s,v) \leq d(s,c) + d(c,v) \leq d(s,v_1) + d(c,u) + 1$$

$$\leq d(s,v_1) + d(v,J) \leq d(s,v_1) + d(v_1,v).$$

This leads to $d(s,v) = d(s,c) + d(c,v)$. Since $d(s,v) = d(s,u)$, we have $d(c,u) = d(c,v)$, a contradiction, and the result follows. □

The results in Lemma 35 lead us to the following definitions. A co-traversal C is said to be *projective* if for every $uv \in Solv(J_i : G_i)$, where $d(u,J) < d(v,J)$ and T_i does not distinguish uv, there exists a vertex $c \in C$ such that $d(u,c) = d(u,J)$. For a co-traversal C we say that a set $\bar{C}_i \subseteq V(G_i)$ is a *C_i-cover* if, for every $c \in C$, there exists a vertex $a \in \bar{C}_i$, such that $d(a,c) = d(a,J)$. We shall categorize the C_i-covers into two types as follow. A C_i-cover $\bar{C}_i$ is called *complete* if $\bar{C}_i$ distinguishes $E(G_i - J_i) - (\parallel (J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i))$. A C_i-cover is called *self-resolving* if $\bar{C}_i$ distinguishes $(E(G_i - J_i)) - \parallel (J_i : G_i)$. For convenience, if $(E(G_i - J_i)) = (\parallel (J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i))$, we consider $\emptyset$ a complete C_i-cover.

If $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ is isometric then for every G_i, a co-traversal C is self-resolving. Moreover, if $(E(G_i - J_i)) \neq (\parallel (J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i))$, C is also complete. Therefore for any co-traversal C, we could always find a set $\mathcal{C} = \{\bar{C}_i\}$ of complete C_i-covers such that $|\cup C_i| \leq |C|$ and the following theorem is an improvement to our previous upper bounds.

Theorem 36. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric, C be a projective co-traversal, T_i's be traversals, and S be a minimal out-solving set for J. Suppose that $\mathcal{C} = \{\bar{C}_i : \bar{C}_i \subseteq V(G_i)\}$ is a set of complete C_i-covers for C. If either there exists a $\bar{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\bar{C}_i$ is self-resolving or for every $c \in C$ there exist two vertices $x \in \bar{C}_i$ and $y \in \bar{C}_j$, where $i \neq j$ such that $d(x,c) = d(x,J)$ and $d(y,c) = d(y,J)$ then*

$$\dim_l(H) \leq \sum |T_i| + |S| + \sum |\bar{C}_i|$$

and the bound is tight.

Proof. For $uv \in E(H)$ we have the following four cases. If $uv \in E(J)$, then it will be distinguished by S. If $uv \in \parallel (J_i : G_i)$, then T distinguishes uv. If

$uv \in (E(G_i - J_i)) - (\parallel (J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i))$, it will be distinguished by $\mathcal{C}$. The last case is if $uv \in Solv(J_i : G_i)$. We could suppose without lost of generality that $d(u, J) < d(v, J)$. If $\bar{C}_i$ is self-resolving then $\bar{C}_i$ distinguishes uv. Otherwise, as C is projective, there exists $c \in C$ such that $d(c, u) = d(u, J)$ and $x \in \bar{C}_j \neq \bar{C}_i$ such that $d(x, c) = d(x, J)$. Then, by Lemma 35 $x \in \bar{C}_j$ distinguishes uv.

Example 34 shows that the bound is tight.

We also have another example showing the tightness of the bound and this example uses a self-resolving cover. Let $V(G_1) = \{u_1, \ldots, u_5\}$, where $G_1 \cong K_5 - \{u_1u_3, u_1u_4\}$, $G_2 \cong C_5$, where $V(G_2) = \{v_i\}$, and $J \cong K_2$, where $V(J_1) = (u_4, u_5)$ and $V(J_2) = (v_3, v_4)$. In this case, $\parallel (J_1 : G_1) = \{u_2u_3\}$ and $\parallel (J_2 : G_2) = \{\}$. We could choose $T_1 = \{u_1\}$ with the advantage that it is both a traversal and a minimal out-solving set for J. As $Solv(J_1 : G_1) = E(G_1) - \{u_1u_2, u_2u_3, u_4u_5\}$, $Solv(J_2 : G_2) = E(G_2) - \{v_3v_4\}$, the co-traversal $C = V(J) = \{u_4, u_5\}$ is projective. We also have $\emptyset$ as a complete C_1-cover and $\{v_1\}$ as a self-resolving C_2-cover. Then $T_1 \cup S \cup \bar{C}_i = \{u_1, v_1\}$ is a local metric set for H and, as H is not bipartite, B is a local metric basis for H. □

If the hypotheses of Theorem 36 are not fulfilled then we have the following result.

Lemma 37. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric, T_i be a traversal for G_i, S be a minimal out-solving set for J, and C be a projective co-traversal. Suppose that $\bar{C}_i$ be a cover such that $|\cup T_i \bigcup S \cup \bar{C}_i|$ is minimum. If for every i, $E(G_i - J_i) =\parallel (J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i)$ and no $\bar{C}_i$ is self-resolving then*

$$\dim_l(H) = \sum |T_i| + |S| + \sum |\bar{C}_i|.$$

We could also extend an existing subgraph amalgamation to a new subgraph amalgamation with a prescribed local metric dimension as stated in the following.

Lemma 38. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric such that $E(G_i - J_i) =\parallel (J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i)$. Let T_i be a traversal for $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ and let S be a minimal out-solving set for J. If there exist C a projective co-traversal, then for every positive integer r there exists a graph A containing J as induced subgraph such that $\dim_l(\amalg\{(G'_i|J'_i)\}) = \sum |T_i| + |S| + r$, where $\{G'_i\} = \{G_i\} \cup \{A\}$.*

Proof. Let $A' = J + K_r$. To ensure isometricity we substitute each edge uv, with $u \in V(K_r)$ and $v \in V(J)$ with a path P_{uv} of length $D(J)$, where $D(J)$ denotes the diameter of J. The resulting graph is the A we are looking for.$\|$ $(J : A) = E(K_r)$. If we denote $V(K_r) = \{u_i\}$, then we can choose as a traversal $T_A = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{r-1}\}$, and so $\{u_r\}$ is a self-resolving cover and the result follows. □

In fact self-resolving covers are not infrequent as we could see in the next lemma.

Lemma 39. *Let $\{(G_i : J_i)\}$ be isometric. If for some G_i, the graph $G_i - E(J_i)$ is bipartite, then there exists $A \subseteq V(G_i)$ such that A is a self-resolving cover for $V(J)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of connected components of $G_i - E(J_i)$. For each $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ let $M_i := \{a_i \in A_i : b_i \in N(a_i) \Rightarrow d(b_i, J) \leq d(a_i, J)\}$. For every $x \in V(J) \cap A_i$, we construct recursive sets $D_{x,k}$ with $D_{x,0} = \{x\}$ and $D_{x,k+1} = \{y \in A_i : d(y, J) = k+1 \wedge N(y) \cap D_{x,k} \neq \emptyset\}$. Eventually, for sufficiently large k_0, $D_{x,k_0} \cap M_i \neq \emptyset$. For $a_i \in D_{x,k_0} \cap M_i$ we have $d(a_i, J) = d(a_i, x)$ and so M_i is a cover for J. Let $uv \in E(G_i - J_i)$, with $d(u, J) \leq d(v, J)$. Then there exists an integer r_0 such that $M_i \cap D_{v,r_0} \neq \emptyset$. Since $G_i - E(J_i)$ is bipartite, then for $a_i \in M_i \cap D_{v,r_0}$, $d(a_i, v) = r_0 - d(v, J) \neq r_0 - d(v, J) + 1 = d(a_i, u)$. This results in M_i being self-resolving. □

We could utilize the former lemma to obtain a new upper bound. For an isometric $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$, define the class $\mathcal{B} = \{G_i : G_i - E(J_i)$ is a bipartite graph$\}$. For $G_i \in \mathcal{B}$, let $M_i := \{a_i \in V(G_i) : b_i \in N(a_i) \Rightarrow d(b_i, J) \leq d(a_i, J)\}$.

Lemma 40. *Let $\{(G_i|J_i)\}$ be isometric. If $E(G_i - J_i) =\|$ $(J_i : G_i) \cup Solv(J_i : G_i)$ and $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ then*

$$\dim_l(H) \leq \sum |T_i| + |S| + \sum |M_i|.$$

The results we presented in this paper still lead to several open questions. Two of those which are of importance are presented here.

Open Question 41. *What are the conditions such that our upper bounds are the exact local metric dimension? Or, does any basis of a subgraph-amalgamation contain a cover?*

Open Question 42. *Is isometricity the least we could ask to obtain more information regarding the local metric dimension? What if we only consider the connectivity of J?*

5. Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Riset Unggulan Perguruan Tinggi 2015, funded by Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education.

References

[1] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty. *Graph theory with applications*, Macmillam Press Ltd. Great Britain (1976).

[2] R. Fraïssé. *Sur l'extension aux relations de quelques propriétés des ordres*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. 71 (1954), 363-388.

[3] M. Bojanczyk, L. Segoufin, S. Torunczyk. *Verification of database-driven systems via amalgamation*, Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS (2013), 63-74.

[4] H. Ehrig and H.-J. Kreowski. *Pushout-Properties: An analysis of gluing constructions for graphs* Math. Nachr., 91 (1979) 135-149

[5] J. Nešetřil *Amalgamation of graphs and its applications*. Second International Conference on Combinatorial Mathematics, Ann. New York Acad. Sci., 319 (1979), 415-428.

[6] F. Okamoto, B. Phinezy, P. Zhang. *The local metric dimension of a graph*. Math. Bohem. 135 (2010), 239-255.

[7] H. Fernau and J.A. Rodríguez-Velázquez. *Notions of Metric Dimension of Corona Products: Combinatorial and Computational Results*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8476 (2014), 153-166.

[8] J.A. Rodríguez-Velázquez, C. García Gómez, G.A. Barragán-Ramírez. *Computing the local metric dimension of a graph from the local metric dimension of primary subgraphs*. Int. J. Comput. Math. 92 (2015), 686-693.

[9] J.A. Rodríguez-Velázquez, C. García Gómez, G.A. Barragán-Ramírez. *On the local metric dimension of corona product graphs*, Bulletin of the Malaysian Mathematical Sciences Society, to appear.

[10] J.A. Rodríguez-Velázquez, C. García Gómez, G.A. Barragán-Ramírez. *Closed formulae for the local metric dimension of corona product graphs*, Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics 46 (2014), 27-34.